#### **REMARKS**

# Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glaser (U.S. Patent No. 4,303,847) in view of *Ohnuma et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,118, 986).

Claims 6-11 have been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement.

## Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 1, 2 and 5-12 remain in this application.

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claims 6-11 have been withdrawn.

In view of Examiner's earlier restriction requirement, applicant retains the right to present claims 6-11 in a divisional application.

## The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glaser* '847 in view of *Ohnuma et al*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

# <u>Independent Claim 1</u>

Independent claim 1, as proposed to be amended, includes a sealing member further comprised of an aluminum material and coated by anodic oxidation with an absorbing material made of a porous aluminum oxide. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in the specification at page 9, lines 12-15. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this amendment. Furthermore, the proposed amendment to claim 1 does not

narrow the intended scope of the claim. Therefore, Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter by the amendment.

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Glaser* '847, either alone or in combination with *Ohnuma et al*, fails to disclose a sealing member comprised of an aluminum material coated by anodic oxidation with an absorbing material made of a porous aluminum oxide. As previously argued, *Glaser* '847 discloses that rear sheet 18 *overlies* a compressible porous sheet, mat or blanket 16. (Col. 3, Il. 42-46.) *Glaser* '847 further discloses a porous blanket 84 over which is *positioned* a rear sheet 85. (See *Glaser* '847, col. 7, Il. 13-19.) Likewise, in describing the Method of Manufacture, *Glaser* '847 discloses that sheet 18 is *placed over* blanket 16. (Col. 7, Il. 51-53.) This method of manufacture merely creates a *force transmitting* relationship between the rear sheet and the blanket. (Col. 9, I. 13.) Although the malleability of the sheet 18 enables it to conform to the shape of the blanket 16, sheet 18 and blanket 16 are individual components. (Col. 4, Il. 39-42.) For example, sheet 18 can be *torn away from* blanket 16 (col. 8, Il. 11-12), or blanket 16 may even be omitted entirely (col. 4, Il. 12-29).

In contrast to the prior art, Applicant's invention, as claimed, describes anodic oxidation. Anodic oxidation causes the aluminum oxide coat to be integrally formed onto the aluminum sealing member at the atomic level. It is not positioned or placed over the aluminum, nor can it be torn away. Hence, the method by which the aluminum oxide coat is formed results in a different structural relationship than that created by the method of manufacture disclosed in *Glaser* '847.

In addition, as recognized by the Examiner, *Glaser* '847 fails to disclose the use of a sealing member in an organic EL device. Therefore, the Examiner relies on *Ohnuma et al* for this teaching. Applicant, however, respectfully maintains as previously argued that there is no motivation to combine the flat-panel display of *Glaser* '847 with the electroluminescent device of *Ohnuma et al*. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that, even if combined, *Glaser* '847 in view of either *Ohnuma et al* or what is well known in the art fails to disclose or teach each and every feature of Applicant's invention as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as proposed to be amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under § 103(a) be withdrawn.

#### Dependent Claims 2, 5 and 12

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2, 5 and 12 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, as proposed to be amended, and the reasons set forth above.

Further, dependent claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as having no patentable weight as a product claim. Claim 5, as proposed to be amended, is directed to an organic EL device wherein the aluminum sheet is formed in such a manner that a surface of the aluminum oxide layer is subjected to gas flow-out treatment in vacuum such that the pores of the surface of the aluminum oxide layer are substantially free of gases. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in the specification at page 5, lines 15-18 and page 9, lines 20-21. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 5, as

Attorney Docket No. 040894-5507

Application No.: 09/447,419

Page 9

proposed to be amended, should be considered for what it recites and the structural consequences thereof. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 5 under

§ 103(a) be withdrawn.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the proposed amendment to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Applicant also requests the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Date:

August 8, 2003

By:

Angela S. Robinson Registration No. 52,174 Tel. No. 202-739-5611

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Customer No. 009629

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel. No.: 202-739-3000 Fax No.: 202-739-3001